



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,403	12/21/2001	Lawrence R. Miller	36287-02001	2495
27171	7590	06/01/2005		
MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY LLP 1 CHASE MANHATTAN PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10005-1413				
EXAMINER GELAGAY, SHEWAYE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2133				

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,403

Applicant(s)

MILLER ET AL.

Examiner

Shewaye Gelagay

Art Unit

2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/21/01
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on March 30, 2005. Claims 1-7, 9-17 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The rejection of claims 14-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for being indefinite is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. The Applicant argues claim 10 is not directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejection. Claim 10 recites "computer executable code transmitted as information signal". The claim recites a software code without any structural element. Therefore, claim 10, is directed to a non-statutory subject matter.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed March 30, 2005, have been considered but are not persuasive. In response to the arguments concerning the previously rejected claims, the following comments are made:

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that grants session credentials) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although

Art Unit: 2133

the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The Applicant argues the combination of Gupta and Makower does not disclose or suggest determining that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by a first system or a second system; sending, from the first system to the client, a log in page; receiving, at the first system from the client, log in information; sending, from the first system to the second system, the log in information; and receiving, at the first system from the second system, information corresponding to a session credential granted by the second system, the session credential granted by the second system based at least in part on the log in information. The Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejections. Gupta teaches a server that checks if a request has an active valid session and redirects the user to the login server. (Col. 7, lines 2-3 and lines 5-6). Gupta also discloses a login server that authenticates and redirects the user back to the application server in which a user request is processed. (Col. 7, lines 10-14) Makower discloses prompting a client with a login page and receiving a client browser that provides authentication information. (Page 4, paragraph 32) As to the amendment a first system and a second system "that grants session credentials" does not render claims 1, 9-13, 17 and 20 patentably distinct over the prior art because Makower further discloses a group of servers in which users are allowed to authenticate themselves with any one of the group of servers. (Abstract; Page 1, paragraph 10; Page 3, paragraph

Art Unit: 2133

20) which is adequate support for a first and second system that grants session credentials.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (hereinafter Gupta) United States Letter Patent Number 6,226,752 further in view of Makower et al. (hereinafter Makower) United States Publication Number 2002/0184507.

Art Unit: 2133

As per claims 1, 10 and 11:

Gupta teaches a method for validating credentials comprising:

determining, at a first system, that a client does not have a valid session credential for the first system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a possible session credential for a second system; (Col. 7, lines 3-4; Col. 11, lines 66-67 and Col. 12, lines 1-6)

presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23) and

determining whether the client has a valid session credential with the second system. (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

Gupta does not explicitly disclose a first and second system that grants a session credential.

Makower discloses a first and second system that grants a session credential. (Abstract; Page 1, paragraph 10; Page 3, paragraph 20; Users authenticate themselves with any one of a group of federated servers)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Gupta to include a method comprising a first and second system that grants a session credential. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Makower (Page 1, paragraph 8)

Art Unit: 2133

in order to protect confidential information and reduce inconvenience for the user/client in having to remember different authorizations for different servers.

As per claims 2 and 14:

The combination of Gupta and Makower teaches a method comprising granting a session credential to the client by the first system, after determining that the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system. (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49 of Gupta)

As per claims 3:

The combination of Gupta and Makower teaches a method comprising sending a session token to the client, the token corresponding to a session credential granted by the first system. (Col. 12, lines 52-53 of Gupta)

As per claim 4:

The combination of Gupta and Makower teaches a method comprising directing the client to the second system to establish a session credential, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system. (Col. 12, lines 54-60 of Gupta)

As per claim 5:

The combination of Gupta and Makower teaches a method comprising directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system. (Page 4, paragraph 31 of Makower)

As per claim 6:

Art Unit: 2133

The combination of Gupta and Makower teaches a method comprising maintaining the client session credential granted by the second system. (Col. 12, lines 54-60; Col. 13, lines 24-26 of Gupta)

As per claim 7:

The combination of Gupta and Makower teaches a method wherein determining whether the client has a valid credential with the second system is at least partially from presenting at least some of the information from the session token. (Col. 12, lines 66-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-5 of Gupta)

As per claim 8:

The combination of Gupta and Makower teaches a method wherein retrieving information from the session token held by the client comprises: sending a query to the client from the first system, the query including identification as originating from a domain name corresponding to the second system; and receiving a response to the query. (Col. 12, lines 48-61 of Gupta)

As per claim 9:

Gupta teaches a method for validating session credentials of a client comprising: determining, at a first system, that a client does not have a valid session credential for the first system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a session credential for a second system, wherein retrieving information from the session token held by the client comprises receiving a

Art Unit: 2133

session token from the client corresponding to the second system; (Col. 7, lines 3-4; Col. 11, lines 66-67 and Col. 12, lines 1-6)

presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23)

determining whether the client has a valid session credential with the second system, wherein determining whether the client has a valid credential with the second system is at least partially from presenting information from the session token; (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

granting a session credential to the client on the first system, after determining that the client has a valid session credential for the second system; (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49)

sending a session token to the client, the token corresponding to the session credential on the first system; (Col. 12, lines 52-53) and

maintaining the client session credentials. (Col. 12, lines 54-60; Col. 13, lines 24-26)

Gupta does not explicitly disclose a first and second system that grants a session credential.

Makower discloses a first and second system that grants a session credential. (Abstract; Page 1, paragraph 10; Page 3, paragraph 20; Users authenticate themselves with any one of a group of federated servers)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Gupta to include

Art Unit: 2133

a method comprising a first and second system that grants a session credential. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Makower (Page 1, paragraph 8) in order to protect confidential information and reduce inconvenience for the user/client in having to remember different authorizations for different servers.

As per claim 12:

Gupta teaches a programmed computer for validating credentials, comprising:
a memory having at least one region for storing computer executable program code; (Figure 1, item 115; Col. 7, lines 50-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-20) and
a processor for executing the program code stored in the memory, (Figure 1, item 113; Col. 7, lines 50-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-20) wherein the program code comprises:

code to determine, at a first system, that a client does not have a valid session credential for the first system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

code to retrieve, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a possible session credential for a second system; (Col. 7, lines 3-4; Col. 11, lines 66-67 and Col. 12, lines 1-6)

code to present at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23) and

code to determine whether the client has a valid session credential with the second system. (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

Art Unit: 2133

Gupta does not explicitly disclose a first and second system that grants a session credential.

Makower discloses a first and second system that grants a session credential. (Abstract; Page 1, paragraph 10; Page 3, paragraph 20; Users authenticate themselves with any one of a group of federated servers)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Gupta to include a method comprising a first and second system that grants a session credential. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Makower (Page 1, paragraph 8) in order to protect confidential information and reduce inconvenience for the user/client in having to remember different authorizations for different servers.

As per claim 13:

Gupta teaches a method for establishing session credentials comprising:
determining that a client does not have a valid session credential for a first system or a second system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)
sending, from the first system to the second system, the log in information; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23) and
receiving, at the first system from the second system, information corresponding to a session credential for the second system, the session credential granted by the second system based at least in part on the log in information. (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49)

Gupta does not explicitly disclose a method comprising sending, from the first system to the client, a log in page; and receiving, at the first system from the client, log in information; and a first and second system that grants a session credential.

Makower in analogous art, however, disclose a method comprising:

sending, from the first system to the client, a log in page; (Page 4, paragraph 32; ...web server prompts the client browser with a log in page ...)

receiving, at the first system from the client, log in information; (Page 4, paragraph 32; the client browser provides authentication information...)

a first and second system that grants a session credential. (Abstract; Page 1, paragraph 10; Page 3, paragraph 20; Users authenticate themselves with any one of a group of federated servers)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Gupta to include a method comprising sending, from the first system to the client, a log in page; receiving, at the first system from the client, log in information; and a first and second system that grants a session credential. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Makower (Page 1, paragraph 8) in order to protect confidential information and reduce inconvenience for the user/client in having to remember different authorizations for different servers.

As per claims 15 and 18:

Art Unit: 2133

The combination of Gupta and Makower teaches a method granting a session credential for the second system. (Col. 12, lines 66-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-5 of Gupta)

As per claims 16 and 19:

The combination of Gupta and Makower teaches a method comprising associating session credentials for the first system and the second system with the client. (Col. 12, lines 54-60; Col. 13, lines 24-26 of Gupta)

As per claim 17:

Gupta teaches a method for establishing session credentials comprising:

determining that a client does not have a valid session credential for a first system or a second system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

sending, from the second system to the client, a log in page; (Col. 12, lines 24-32)

receiving, at the second system from the client, log in information; (Col. 12, lines 24-32) and

sending, from the second system to the first system, information corresponding to a session credential for the second system, the session credential granted by the second system based at least in part on the log in information; (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30) and

granting a session credential for the first system. (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49)

Gupta does not explicitly disclose a first and second system that grants a session credential.

Art Unit: 2133

Makower discloses a first and second system that grants a session credential.

(Abstract; Page 1, paragraph 10; Page 3, paragraph 20; Users authenticate themselves with any one of a group of federated servers)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Gupta to include a method comprising a first and second system that grants a session credential. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Makower (Page 1, paragraph 8) in order to protect confidential information and reduce inconvenience for the user/client in having to remember different authorizations for different servers.

As per claim 20:

Gupta teaches a method for validating credentials comprising:

determining, at a first system, that a client does not have a valid session credential for the first system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

redirecting the client to a second system; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23)

sending, from the second system to the first system, session credentials for the second system; (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

sending, from the second system to the first system, information indicating that the session credentials for the second system are valid. (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

sending, from the first system to the second system, the session credentials for the second system; (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49)

determining, at the second system, that the session credentials for the second system, received from the first system, are valid; (Col. 13, lines 1-5)

Gupta does not explicitly disclose a first and second system that grants a session credential.

Makower discloses a first and second system that grants a session credential. (Abstract; Page 1, paragraph 10; Page 3, paragraph 20; Users authenticate themselves with any one of a group of federated servers)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Gupta to include a method comprising a first and second system that grants a session credential. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Makower (Page 1, paragraph 8) in order to protect confidential information and reduce inconvenience for the user/client in having to remember different authorizations for different servers.

As per claim 21:

The combination of Gupta and Makower teaches a method comprising granting the client session credentials for the first system. (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49 of Gupta)

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2133

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shewaye Gelagay *SG*
Examiner
Art Unit 2133

5/6/05

AD
ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100